

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Response is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination. This Communication is responsive to the Advisory Action dated June 6, 2006 and to the Final Office Action mailed January 30, 2006. Applicants bring to the Examiner's attention the Supplementary Information Disclosure Statement filed along with this Communication.

Claims 1-39 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 14 and 24 and the Examiner's indication that claims 9, 12, 13 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-8, 10, 11, 16-23 and 25-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,450 to *Angwin et al.* (hereinafter "Angwin").

Applicants disagree with the Examiner's basis for these rejections, but to expedite prosecution have amended claims 1, 17, 25, 32 and 35.

Independent claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35 of the currently pending application, as amended, are related to an approach to provide requested reference information to a user via a mobile terminal. After the user enters a request identifier (*e.g.*, a word to be language translated), it is determined whether the information requested is locally stored at the wireless terminal. If the information is locally stored, the information is retrieved from local storage and is presented to the user. If the information is not locally stored, the user is notified and a connection is established between the wireless terminal and a data server.

Independent claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35 have been amended to include, in some form, notifying a user if the desired reference information is not locally stored. The claim amendments are supported, for example, in the specification at page 10 lines 3-4 and at Figure 6, reference number 614. As discussed in the specification, notifying the user that the information is not locally stored may be beneficial, for example, to provide the user with an option to request the reference information via the network.

Angwin teaches a data communications management system that enables the use of conventional network applications to facilitate mobile communications. Angwin describes a call manager that intercepts and analyzes all communication calls from applications on the local system and redirects them to an appropriate call handler. The call handler then performs functions transparently impersonating the remote target of the communication. (See, for example, the Abstract of Angwin).

To anticipate a claim, the asserted reference must clearly and unequivocally disclose every element of the claimed invention. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. All claim elements, and their limitations, must be found in the prior art reference to maintain a rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102.

The Angwin reference does not teach or suggest several claim elements of Applicant's independent claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35. For example, unlike claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35 of the instant application, Angwin's approach clearly does not teach or suggest notifying the user if the desired reference information is locally stored. In contrast, Angwin teaches away from the concept of notifying the user if the data is not locally stored. See, for example, the Abstract of Angwin which states "the call handler performs functions *transparently* impersonating the remote target." Transparent operation involves operation that is undetectable by the user.

For at least the reasons discussed above, independent claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35 of the instant application are not anticipated by Angwin.

Regarding the rejections of dependent claims 2-8, 10, 11, 16-23, 26-31, 33, and 34-39, these claims are also not anticipated by Angwin. Each of these dependent claims depends from base claims 1, 17, 25, 32, or 35 that are patentably distinct for reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, the rejections of the dependent claims cannot be supported based on obviousness. Specifically regarding the rejection of dependent claims 2, 5-8, 10, 11, and 16, the Examiner states that Angwin does not explicitly disclose specifics involving the use

of WAP, determining if sufficient local storage exists, determining the most frequency requested request identifiers, initiating default activities upon fulfillment of the predetermined activity condition, and the reference information being dictionary definitions or language translations.

The arguments presented above in connection with independent claims 1, 17, 25, 32, and 35 are reasserted with respect to the rejections of these dependent claims. Dependent claims 2, 5-8, 10, 11, and 16 are not anticipated by Angwin, as these claims depend from base claims 1, 17, 25, 32, or 35 that are patentably distinct for reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, it would appear that the Examiner is impermissibly taking official notice that certain elements of Applicants' claims 2, 5-8, 10, 11, and 16 constitute facts outside of the record which are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well known or obvious to one skilled in the art. Applicants respectfully request, should the rejections be maintained, that the Examiner produce references supporting the Examiner's assertion that claims 2, 5-8, 10, 11, and 16 are obvious.


It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to Examiner's characterization of the asserted art or Applicants' claimed subject matter, nor of the Examiner's application of the asserted art or combinations thereof to Applicant's claimed subject matter. Moreover, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's statements or conclusions concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, obvious design choices, common knowledge at the time of Applicants' invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. Applicants reserve the right to address in detail the Examiner's characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKV.007PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: 6/28/2006

By: 

Clara Davis
Reg. No. 50,495